Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges insists that by selling to the Chinese Reds and the Soviet, the United States will eliminate unemployment, increase production and in general guarantee its own prosperity.

The United States doesn't need to trade with the enemy to prosper. Despite keen competition in world markets, America's businessmen have more than held their own. In fact, their exports have expanded. In the first 7 months of this year, commercial shipments were at an annual rate of $21.5 billion, up 2 percent from the previous year.

The administration nevertheless is bent on greatly increasing trade with the Communists, supplying them the foodstuffs and industrial equipment they need to continue their campaign of harassment against the free world.

A change in trade policies is essential. But they should not involve trade deals that would give aid and comfort to the enemy.

An Important New Book by Father Robert F. Drinan, S.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call attention to a new book by the dean of Boston College Law School entitled "Religion, the Courts and Public Policy."

Father Drinan is one of the most distinguished Jesuit priests in the United States, a leading American intellectual and an outstanding civil leader. His opinions on church-state matters and other issues are of major concern to all of us, and this book deserves wide reading.

In a New York Times Book review, the eminent critic, John Cogley, stated that the dean's book "reflected a philosophic as well as legal turn of mind worthy of any jurist's attention."

Going beyond Mr. Cogley, I would like to say that the book should also be of interest to every Member of Congress. I am happy to include a review of this book which appeared in the Sui Juris, the publication of the Boston College Law School, September 1963. As a graduate of this school, I am deeply proud of its great tradition and, of course, of its distinguished dean. The article follows:

FATHER DRINAN'S BOOK IS WIDELY ACCLAIMED

Father Drinan's recent book, "Religion, the Courts and Public Policy," has been widely acclaimed by reviewers across the country.

In his book, the dean examines the three major problems that have aroused so much controversy in the past few years: religious education in the public schools, tax support of church-related schools and the Sabbatarians' request to work on Sundays. He thoroughly discusses three basic issues that have reached the U.S. Supreme Court: released time, Bible reading, and the reading of the Lord's prayer.

Father Drinan discusses his topics from the points of view of the main parties concerned, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, and nonbelievers, and also examines the historical and legal aspects, pointing out the confusions that have arisen because of the many interests involved and because of what he feels are the inherent contradictions of recent Supreme Court decisions defining the place of religion in relation to the tax-supported school.

The dean points out that it was not until 1947 that the Supreme Court was called upon to rule on the first amendment clause that for 150 years the Nation seemed to be satisfied with the status quo. He deals in detail with the many areas in which an almost universally accepted understanding on church-state matters exist, tax exemption for churches, for example.

"Whenever conflicts arise out of hitherto settled legal-moral or church-state issues," Father Drinan writes, "the contemporary tendency is to attempt to resolve all these problems by immediate reference to the first amendment and the U.S. Supreme Court. The wisdom of employing the establishment and free exercise clauses of the first amendment for such purposes is open to question. In a relationship as profound and complex as that between church and State it should not be expected that one set of legal-moral or constitutional principles will render self-evident the rights of all interested parties."

The dean also writes that "the profoundly religious and theistic presuppositions of the American state appear to be so deeply ingrained in American public policy that it is doubtful if congressional or Supreme Court endorsements of a neutral or secular state can, in the absence of a complete reversal of public opinion, change the fundamental direction of church-state attitudes in America. But new and influential voices today are urging as never before that the American state can and must be not merely neutral, but avowedly secular in its attitude to all religious groups. The entire future not only of American church-state relations but of this Nation's public and private morality will depend on the extent to which American lawmakers are influenced by those individuals who feel that the total separation of government from religion is a desirable development."

John Cogley, reviewing the book for the New York Times on Sunday, August 4, characterized Father Drinan's understanding of the characteristically Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jewish, and secular humanists approaches to the various problems of church-state relations as "better than many of his coreligionists, including some eminent prelates who tend to see our current church-state controversies as simple contests between the forces of faith and those of irreligion." Mr. Cogley stated that the dean's questions "reflected a philosophic as well as legal turn of mind worthy of any jurist's attention." The book has also been reviewed favorably in numerous other publications including the National Observer, wherein it was said that when the dean "writes of issues that most distress Protestants (religion in the public classroom) and Jews (Sunday closing laws), he writes brilliantly and fairly."

Wrong Method in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD an editorial by John R. Scamehorn, in the Niles (Mich.) Daily Star on October 2, 1963. This editorial expresses the current attitude of many Americans on our foreign aid programs, and I commend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

WRONG METHOD

The House has voted for a $585 million cut in foreign aid. But even at the $3.5 billion level approved by the House, foreign aid will cost the average American family about $70 a year. This amount would pay a month's average rent, buy a new suit, or meet a car payment.

Even if the average American could spare this amount, the world could still not become rich on it. Nor would all misery and suffering be eliminated from every nook and cranny of the globe even if all of this country's income were to be distributed around the world. As President Kennedy, when he served as a Member of the House, was quoted in 1951 in the Boston Globe as saying:

"The vision of a bottle of milk for every Hottentot is a nice one, but is far beyond our reach. There is just not enough money in the world to relieve the poverty of all the millions of this world who may be threatened by communism."

Bottlefeeding the world is still beyond the means of the United States.

There is nothing wrong with the principle of foreign aid, though. What is wrong is the method of applying it.

Americans are always ready to help the needy, but they have become aware that relatively little of their foreign aid tax money helps other peoples much. Indonesia's starving millions didn't benefit when the United States made an emergency loan to help their economy. Their Government bought several passenger jet airplanes.

But the United States continues to provide loans and grants. If a nation is friendly, that is given as a reason; if it is indifferent or hostile, that is deemed a good reason, too.

Here in the United States the steel industry is striving to raise slightly more than a billion dollars for a single year's improvements. Meanwhile, our Government wants to loan the Indian Government a billion dollars of tax money for steel expansion because India can't get private capital. Why? Their laws and regulations upon business, plus political decisions involved in them, forbid prudent men from putting up the money. So our Government proposes to use the money of American taxpayers.

In the past 16 years, the United States has loaned or given more than 100 nations a total of more than $124 billion, including interest paid on the money that was borrowed to give away. Many of the nations which have received these funds have closer ties to Russia today than to the United States. The failings of our foreign aid administration have not been trivial.

Even so, most Americans probably are not opposed to foreign aid of itself. But no doubt there is a belief that if spending is confined to those programs and projects which make a minimum of sense, the $3.5 billion suggested by the House should be sufficient.

Recognition for Test Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. McLOSKEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. McLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, at the annual convention of the Illinois Asso-

ciated Press editors held in the city of Chicago, a series of articles on the nuclear test ban treaty by Mr. Jerry Moriarity, editor of the Kewanee Star-Courier, was judged as the best single entry in its class.

This was a well-deserved recognition for outstanding news reporting and I am pleased this honor came to Mr. Moriarity. This editor of a small city newspaper typifies all that is decent and good in the news media field and is a shining example of why the freedom of the press must be preserved.

Mr. Moriarity must feel a deep sense of pride in accepting this honor and I wish him continued success in his efforts to bring interesting, factual and readable material to the subscribers of this fine Midwest newspaper.

I ask permission to insert an editorial from the Star-Courier of Monday, September 30, which was written after the award was made.

[From the Kewanee (Ill.) Star-Courier, Sept. 30, 1963]

RECOGNITION FOR TEST SERIES

That a special award for the best entry in the Illinois Associated Press newswriting contest in our circulation category was earned by this department for a series of articles on the nuclear test ban treaty is both pleasing and reassuring to us in the newsroom.

You may recall that early in August this department published a three-part series, which included a review of a new and controversial book, "Nuclear Ambush—The Test Ban Trap." The book was authored by Earl H. Voss, former La Crosse, Wis., Tribune newspaperman with whom we were associated in the days immediately before World War II. He now is a respected chronicler of events in our Nation's capital as a top writer for the Washington Star.

We tried to balance his work with information obtained from other sources, but the conclusions seemed to point the same, that peaceful nuclear test fallout dangers had been exaggerated. It was interesting to hear our State's own Democratic Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS admit in an interview at the Kewanee Post Office dedication that the fallout dangers were not as great as originally believed.

There are other aspects still to come out. Now it is reported that Gen. Thomas H. Power, head of the Strategic Air Command, who urged votes against the ban treaty, felt the United States must be free to test high-megaton bombs in the atmosphere to find out effects on communications and missile systems.

When the Russians exploded their big bomb 2 years ago, parts of our defense communications system and a number of our concrete-shielded ICBM's were rendered useless because of electronic magnetic pulses set off. We were as helpless as kittens.

However, the treaty now is a reality and, as the sopnsors hope, could be a step toward a longtime peaceful era.

Presentation of these and other thought-provoking articles is done as part of our attempt to bring to our readers interesting and readable material. That this particular series on the nuclear test ban treaty was judged as the best single entry in the newswriting contest is relatively unimportant, but we must frankly admit we are pleased with the recognition.

Inaugural Address of Dr. George Alexander Heard, Fifth Chancellor of Vanderbilt University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 7, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday Dr. George Alexander Heard was inaugurated as chancellor of Vanderbilt University—my own university. Dr. Heard became the fifth chancellor of this university in its 90-year history and delivered a magnificent and inspiring address.

Dr. Heard, former dean of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina and a distinguished political scientist and author, noted with pride the past history of the university and pledged an all-out effort to meet the challenges and responsibilities of the future.

More than 5,000 attended Chancellor Heard's inauguration, including representatives of 256 colleges and universities around the world, 26 educational societies, and friends and alumni of Vanderbilt University.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to insert the inaugural address of Dr. George Alexander Heard, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, at this point in the RECORD.

CHANCELLOR TELLS PLANS

Ladies and gentlemen, we of Vanderbilt have come together this autumn afternoon to reaffirm again our faith, and to speak aloud our dreams for this noble and historic university, set in a great strategic center of our Nation, in a great strategic time in our history.

I, myself, draw strength from the presence of many friends whose generous spirits have led them here this day, and from the honor done Vanderbilt University by these many delegates from the world's community of education. No university stands alone. All men everywhere have a stake in the welfare of every university anywhere.

CITES GOVERNOR, MAYOR

I cherish especially the presence of two alumni, the Governor of our State and mayor of our metropolitan government. They not only offer testimony that Vanderbilt's sons make good. They also symbolize Vanderbilt's long role as a private university in the public service.

The kind and thoughtful words spoken by the representatives of our immediate university family—a student, an alumnus, a faculty member—give me heart, and I am grateful for the informed observations and felicitous greetings borne here by the eminent president of America's oldest and the world's greatest university. I thank you all.

There is considerable comfort, too, in the survival power of Vanderbilt's chief executive officers. It is demonstrated on this platform by former Chancellors Oliver C. Carmichael and Harvie Branscomb. They look hearty to me, and I am touched by their courtesy in coming, and I am stirred by their imposing careers as creative and tireless leaders, at home and broad, of education in a world afflicted.

STILL IN SERVICE

The sense of continuity of Vanderbilt University is much with us this day. Persons who took part in installing both of these chancellors are here. I have been intrigued to note that even those who spoke over a quarter of a century ago for the students, the alumni, and the faculty at the time of Chancellor Carmichael's investiture—Randolph Batson, Eldon Stevenson, Jr., and Madison Sarratt—are all here this afternoon, all still in the service of the university.

These men make us realize how close the past is to us. And if the past is close, the future must be too, so we shall hurry along

Vanderbilt proclaims itself a university.

Vanderbilt's duty is to be a university to be fully a university in the largest, modern meaning of that ancient, always-changing institution.

OPENED IN 1875

Vanderbilt has been commited to many features of a university from its beginning. It offered, from the outset, in addition to its curriculum in philosophy, science, and literature, programs of instruction for three professions—law, medicine, the ministry. It opened its doors in 1875, one year before the founding of the first great graduate school in America, the Johns Hopkins University, and it grew to manhood in the first upward sweep of graduate education across our land. Chancellor Kirkland found it tactful on assuming office in 1893 to state that he did not plan to follow the advice of the university's friends who urged that college offerings be abandoned and that the university devote itself exclusively to postgraduate work.

Undergraduate education occupied then, as it does now, and as it shall in the future, the center of Vandebilt's attention. Our undergraduate schools and colleges are inseparable from the larger university. In the main, they are the same professors and the same facilities. Yet a university is more than a collection of colleges, and it is this something more that defines Vanderbilt's duty of which I speak today.

TEACH AND TRAIN

As I read the history of universities, now stretching across eight centuries in the Western World, the thread that runs through the university as a distinctive social institution, in all its forms in all the centuries, is the thread of inquiry.

Colleges and other educational institutions may bring the student to beauty, or thought, or skill, or maturity. They teach and train, Sometimes their object is the whole man, sometimes just his hands or one section of his brain. Universities do these things too, but it is the addition of expoloration to exposition that underlies the unique opportunities of a university. And if and institution is to be a university, it must provide the conditinons under which this exploration can take place. The thread of inquiry has no meaning without freedom to inquire, and freedom to state the conclusions of inquiry. There is no inquiry without freedom, and no university without both.

ROOTS GO DEEP

Vanderbilt's duty as a university is rooted deep in the significance to the world around us of university inquiry. It is rooted deep in the significance to the world around us of university freedom.

Mr. Pusey's panorama of a modern university in motion explains how universities are more important in these years of our lives than they have ever been before. It